

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Rec'd PCT/PTO 18 JAN 2005

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

10/521684

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

To:

Bullit OY
Krokuddsgränden 1
FIN-02230 ESBO
FinlandDate of mailing
(day/month/year)

26-05-2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

REPLY DUE

within 60 days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/FI 2003/000549

International filing date (day/month/year)

07.07.2003

Priority date (day/month/year)

18.07.2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

A61F 7/07

Applicant

SERLACHIUS, Jarl, Fredrik

1. ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:
☐ is ☐ is not
considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This _____ (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.
- When?** See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).
- How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.
- Also** For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
- If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 18.11.2004

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket

Box 5055

S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

Authorized officer

Magnus Thorén/EK

Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/FI 2003/000549

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:

- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed.")*:

☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished

☐ the description:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the claims:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the drawings:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FI 2003/000549

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

Claims

2. Citations and explanations:

The present invention relates to an ice-hockey or soccer player peg, intended to be moved directly by hand along a track. The invention is characterised in that a button, that keeps the player in the track, is fastened to an eccentric shaft. The eccentric shaft enables a smooth move of the player peg.

The cited DE 1092354 describes a player peg, which is intended to be moved along a track and kept in the track by a button on an eccentric shaft.

This peg is, however, not an ice-hockey or soccer player peg, and the shaft is not intended to make the movement smoother, since the movement is sideways only.

Thus, the invention is novel.

The invention is considered to involve an inventive step.

The invention is industrially applicable.